IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM
PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.S.RADHAKRISHNAN
&
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANTONY DOMINIC

TUESDAY, THE 19TH JUNE 2007 / 29TH JYAISHTA 1929
WP(C).No. 17849 of 2007(Y)

PETITIONER:
---

1. SASI, AGED 50 YEARS, S/O.VELAYUDHAN, KANATTUPARAMBIL, THEVARA, COCHIN - 13.

2. HANEEFA, AGED 50 YEARS, S/O.LATE HAMEED, CHIRIYALITHARA, THEVARA, COCHIN-13.
3. RAJU, AGED 55 YEARS, S/O.LATE VARGHESE, THOPPIL HOUSE, THEVARA P.O., COCHIN-13.

BY ADV. SRI.GEORGE SEBASTIAN

RESPONDENTS:
---

1. CORPORATION OF COCHIN, REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY, COCHIN CORPORATION.

2. DISTRICT COLLECTOR, ERNAKULAM.

3. GREATER COCHIN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY, ERNAKULAM.

4. INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL WELFARE REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY, MAJOR M.G.C.NAIR, (RETD), 129-BMRI, BALAKRISHNA MENON ROAD, EDAPPALLY, COCHIN-682 024.

BY ADV. SRI.M.K.CHANDRAMOHAN DAS,SC,COCHIN COPN
SRI.P.R.RAMACHANDRA MENON, SC,GCDA

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 19/06/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

APPENDIX

PETITIONERS' EXTS:

EXT.P1 TRUE COPY OF JUDGMENT DT. 15.10.2003 IN OP 28312/2000

EXT.P2 TRUE COPY OF LETTER DT. 11.10.2004 ISSUED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT TO ITS STANDING COUNSEL

EXT.P3 TRUE COPY OF RELEVANT PAGES OF CONTEMPT PETITION FILED BY THE 4TH RESPONDENT DT. 18.6.2004.

EXT.P4 TRUE COPY OF ORDER DATED 25.9.2006 OF THIS HONOURABLE COURT IN THE CONTEMPT PETITION NO.842/04

EXT.P5 (A) TRUE COPY OF NOTICE DATED 6.6.2007 ISSUED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT TO THE 1ST PETITIONER.

EXT.P5(B) TRUE COPY OF NOTICE DT. 6.6.07 ISSUED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT TO THE 3RD PETITIONER.

K.S.Radhakrishnan
&
Antony Dominic, JJ.
==========
W.P(C)No.17849 of 2007
==========

Dated this the 19th day of June, 2007.

JUDGMENT

Radhakrishnan,J.

This Writ Petition has been preferred for a writ of mandamus directing respondents 1 to 3 to keep in abeyance all proceedings in pursuance to Exts.P5(A) and P5(B) for a period of two months and also for a direction to respondents 1 to 3 to see that Exts.P5(A) and P5 (B) are not implemented till concrete steps for rehabilitation of the petitioners are taken. Counsel for the Corporation submitted that steps have been for eviction of unauthorised occupants in view of the various orders passed by this Court including an order passed in Contempt Case (Civil) No.842 of 2004. In such circumstance, we see no justification to extend the time sought for. So far as second relief is concerned, we are informed by the counsel appearing for the Corporation that the Corporation is thinking of extending the benefit of

rehabilitation scheme to the eligible persons. Petitioners, if so advised may approach the Corporation seeking reliefs.

Writ Appeal is dismissed.

K.S.Radhakrishnan,
Judge.

Antony Dominic,
Judge.

ess 20/6